UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2495th MEETING: 11 NOVEMBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2495)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16036)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2495th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 11 November 1983, at 12 noon

President: Mr. Victor J. GAUCI (Malta).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2495)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16036)

The meeting was called to order at 12.20 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like at the outset of this meeting on behalf of the Council to pay a tribute to Mr. Abdullah Salah, representative of Jordan, for the great diplomatic skill with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16036)

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2480th meeting, I invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Security Council table; Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Sudan in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: It will be recalled that the 2480th meeting of the Security Council, held on tnis item on 18 October 1983, had to be adjourned in view of the lateness of the hour.

5. I now call on the representative of Israel.

6. Mr. BLUM (Israel): At the outset, Sir, permit me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of November. We have full confidence that you, Sir, will conduct the Council's business with fairness and impartiality.

7. It is also the custom of many speakers on such an occasion to express appreciation to the outgoing President. For reasons that will become obvious in the course of my statement, I am unable today to follow that practice.

8. This indeed is a continuation of the discussion that took place at the 2480th meeting of the Council, held on 18 October, at which time I put down my name to speak in exercise of the right of reply. For reasons that I shall discuss in a moment, I could not exercise my right of reply during the three and a half weeks that have elapsed since, but I wish to regard this meeting as a continuation of the 2480th meeting. I shall therefore refrain from going into events that have occurred in Lebanon since 18 October. We are all familiar with them: large-scale killings have taken place, affecting primarily innocent civilians. But, for reasons well understood in the Council and beyond, the Council has not found the time and opportunity to discuss those events.

9. We all know the reasons. We have been told by various Arab representatives over the years that when Arabs kill Arabs it is a family affair, and the United Nations should not become interested in those events. And we have seen that pattern over the years. We saw it a couple of months ago in the Shouf mountains, when Arabs were killing Arabs—again, involving primarily innocent civilians. And the Council and the United Nations as a whole remained inactive.

10. We saw the same pattern last year, in February of 1982, when the enlightened régime of Hafez al-Assad in

Syria massacred about 20,000 of its own citizens in the city of Hama and razed the old city of Hama to the ground. And the Council and the United Nations remained inactive, because that was a family affair.

11. We saw it in 1976, when the Syrians invaded Lebanon and, among the many atrocities which they perpetrated, committed the large-scale massacre of Tel-el-Za'atar. And nobody was interested, in the Council or elsewhere, because that too was a family affair.

12. So, we accept the fact that this is apparently a novel doctrine in international relations—perhaps it should be called the "family doctrine"—and that, therefore, we are not supposed to discuss these and similar outrages.

13. There is, of course, an exception to the rule, to the "family doctrine". In those instances when Arabs are killing Arabs and somehow Israel can be dragged into the picture, the Council is galvanized into instant action: emergency meetings, midnight meetings, past-midnight meetings, condemnations—not of the Arabs who killed Arabs, but of Israel, which did not kill those Arabs. And not content with such emergency meetings, we also have emergency special sessions of the General Assembly, in violation of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, under which emergency special sessions cannot be held when a regular session of the General Assembly is taking place. Everything can be discarded and ignored when it comes to Israel. Everything becomes permissible then.

14. But, as I have said, these are things that I am not going to talk about, because I am adhering to the norms of the Council, according to which it is improper to get into the family affairs of such a nice family.

15. I do want to address myself to what happened at the 2480th meeting of the Council, and, since three and a half weeks have passed since that meeting, I feel constrained to refresh the memory of the Council. At the end of that meeting the person who occupied the Chair of the Council last month made the following statement:

> "Requests have been made to be allowed to exercise the right of reply. However, in view of the lateness of the hour, I intend, with the consent of the Council, to adjourn at this time. The time of the next meeting will be decided upon after consultations with members." [*2480th meeting, para. 89.*]

16. That was a highly unusual statement. If indeed the lateness of the hour prompted the person who occupied the Chair last month to make that statement, nothing would have been more natural for him than to announce that, due to the lateness of the hour, the Council would reconvene in the afternoon, or the following morning, or the following afternoon. This formula—"the next meeting will be decided upon after consultations with members"—is not reserved for such eventualities as that which the Council was dealing with on 18 October.

17. No Council meeting was convened on the 18th in the afternoon, on the 19th in the morning, or on the 19th in the afternoon. To the best of my knowledge, no consultations took place until I approached you, Mr. President, after you took office, and sought an explanation of what had happened to that unfinished business of ours.

18. I know of course that we have had many important events since, and that the Council has not been exactly idle. The Council discussed Namibia; the Council discussed the situation in Grenada; the Council even met for its annual meeting on the Iran-Iraq war. But the fact remains that, having adjourned the meeting without calling on the representative who had asked to exercise the right of reply on 18 October, on the pretext of the lateness of the hour, the person who occupied the Chair of the Council last month did not conduct any consultations with a view to reconvening the Council to complete that unfinished business.

19. But who are we to challenge his good faith? We are all convinced that he acted in good faith and that no impropriety was involved, despite appearances to the contrary, for we must ask ourselves in seriousness, "What could have prompted the person who occupied the Chair of the Council last month to behave as he did?" For that, I again to refresh the memory of members.

20. On 18 October, I made a statement which began as follows:

> "Permit me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. You and I represent in the United Nations the two States that emerged on the territory of the former Palestine Mandate—one Arab and one Jewish. For reasons well known to all of us, we have not been able thus far to enjoy the blessings of peace in our bilateral relations. I know you will join me in expressing the hope that our two countries will soon establish peace, good-neighbourliness and friendship for their own benefit and for the benefit of the entire region." [*Ibid., para. 60.*]

21. When I finished my statement, the person occupying the Chair of the Council last month made the following statement:

> "The Council has heard the statement by the representative of Israel. I should like to point out the ill will and hypocrisy evident in that statement, especially as regards his country's alleged love of peace. I think it my duty as representative of Jordan to remind the Council that Israel, which arrogantly speaks of peace, has occupied Jerusalem, the West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights for more than 16 years, in addition to its occupation of southern Lebanon, its refusal to be inclined towards peace ever since it was established, its dependence on military expansion and its attempt to impose its domination and hegemony over the region at the expense of its indigenous peoples." [*Ibid., para. 76.*]

22. I could stop here. The abuse of the Chair by the person who occupied that Chair last month is patently evident. But I should like to spell out the many impropriе-

ties and breaches of propriety that were committed by the person who occupied the Chair of the Council last month in behaving as he did.

23. First of all, it is a custom of long standing in the Council for us to approach the Chair with the utmost courtesy. One expression of this practice is that we all express our respects to the Chair on the first occasion we have, each month, to address the Council. But this practice is predicated on reciprocity. The Chair owes the same courtesy to representatives. Otherwise the whole practice becomes meaningless. It was in keeping with that practice that I expressed my respects to the President for last month at the beginning of my first statement during that month. The person who occupied the Chair of the Council last month knew full well how to respond to such expressions of respect to him. I was not the only speaker. When the representative of Lebanon concluded his statement, he said, "I thank the representative of Lebanon for the kind words he addressed to me" [*ibid., para 11*]. When the representative of the Netherlands concluded his statement, he responded by saying "I thank the representative of the Netherlands for his kind words about me" [*ibid., para 25*]. When the representative of the Soviet Union concluded his statement, the person who occupied the Chair of the Council remembered to tell him that he thanked the representative of the Soviet Union "for the kind words he addressed to me" [*ibid., para 48*]. And so it went with the representative of the United Kingdom, the representative of Syria—in other words, everyone who addressed that Council during that meeting, with one exception: the Chair last month believed that it could treat Israel in a discriminatory manner. The person who occupied the Chair last month should be disabused of that notion in front of the Council.

24. But that was not the only impropriety. We must ask ourselves. "Was the person in question speaking as President or as representative of his country?", for somebody saw to it that the *Journal* of the United Nations of 19 October, the day following the debate here, stated, when reporting that meeting of the Council, that "The President, in his capacity as the representative of Jordan, made a statement." This is not in keeping with the realities.

25. It is a long-established practice that when the Presidents of the Council speak as the representatives of their own countries, they usually reserve those statements for the end of the debate. I do not have to belabour this point; I will give the Council one example, and the example is the debate that took place on the situation in Grenada last month under the presidency of the same person. You will find his statement as the representative of his country in the verbatim record of that meeting. He was indeed the last speaker, and what he said was the following. He began, "I shall now make a statement as the representative of JORDAN" [*2491st meeting, para. 410*]. And when he concluded his statement, he very properly said, "I now resume my capacity as PRESIDENT of the Security Council." [*Ibid., para 417*]. This is the accepted procedure.

26. When it comes to Israel, the person who occupied the Chair last month apparently acted on the belief that everything was permissible. So, suddenly, he leaps into the debate not, allegedly, as President of the Council but as the representative of his own country and, lo and behold, he does not even say at the beginning of his statement that he is speaking on behalf of his country. What does he say? He says the following: "The Council has heard the statement by the representative of Israel" [*2480th meeting, para. 76*]. This is the expression of thanks for the compliments that I paid him: "I should like to point out the ill will and hypocrisy evident in that statement, especially as regards his country's alleged love of peace" [*ibid.*]. Where is the slightest indication so far that this misbehaviour of the Chair was indeed not a statement by the Chair but by the representative of Jordan?

27. The person who occupied the Chair last month did not indicate at the beginning of his statement that he was speaking on behalf of his country, just as he did not indicate at the end of his statement that he was resuming his functions as President.

28. There is one lonely reference in the middle of his statement, as follows: "I think it my duty as representative of Jordan to remind the Council..." [*ibid*]. He must have realized in the middle of his statement that what he was doing was highly improper. But that certainly cannot undo the first sentence in which he, in his capacity as President of the Council, maligned the representative of a Member State, without even apologizing to him afterwards. And I do not even want to discuss the very pertinent question why expressions of hope for peace between two countries which do not enjoy peace at the moment should be regarded by any member of the Council as expressions of "ill will and hypocrisy" and so on.

29. I committed a terrible sin. I had the audacity to suggest that the person who occupied the Council's Chair last month would join me in expressing the hope for early peace, good-neighbourliness and friendship between our two countries. This is something terrible. It should not be heard in the Council. It is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, which supposedly entrusts the Council with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. But that, of course, is something that I do not want to go into. It is sufficient for me to point out the serious improprieties committed by the person who occupied the Chair last month in the course of that meeting [*2480th meeting*], without any visible reaction on the part of the Council.

30. I know of course how certain members of the Council felt about that episode, because they did not hide it in private. Some thought the behaviour was outrageous; others characterized it as an abuse of the Chair; again, others defined it as "a heavy-handed conduct". But all those things were said privately, and nobody saw fit to call to order the person who occupied the Chair.

31. What does all this amount to? What it means is that we have come a very long way indeed from the first years of the Organization, at a time when certain fundamental canons of decency were still observed in the Organization.

32. Permit me very briefly to illustrate the road that we have travelled over the pst 30 years. I wish briefly to refer members of the Council to the 655th meeting of the Council that took place on 21 January 1954—almost 30 years ago. It was the first meeting for that year and, therefore, at the beginning of the meeting, as is customary, the incoming members of the Council were welcomed and appreciation was expressed to the members who had left the Council on 31 December 1953. And, then, the Council turned to the business on its agenda. It was a dispute between Syria and Israel. It so happened that during that month of January 1954 the Council was presided over by the representative of Lebanon at the time, Mr. Charles Malik, an illustrious statesman who subsequently also became the President of the General Assembly. When the Council reached that stage of its discussions, the President of the Council, Mr. Malik, made the following statement:

> "Rule 20 of our rules of procedure makes it possible for the President to yield his Chair for the time being to the member of the Council next in alphabetical order, if his country is directly interested in and has a direct connection with the matter under consideration. I propose to invoke this rule, and submit to the Council that I should like my colleague, the representative of New Zealand, to replace me, and myself to replace him as an ordinary member of the Council, during the debate on this item. It will be remembered from the text of rule 20 that this convenience is intended only for purposes of the debate under consideration, and does not affect the functions or the responsibilities of the President otherwise." [*655th meeting, para. 37.*]

Lebanon was not a party to that dispute, but Mr. Malik was decent enough to reach on his own the conclusion that it was not proper in the circumstances for him to function as President at that meeting.

33. The person who occupied the Chair last month did not have that sensitivity and, moreover, proved his lack of sensitivity in the way he behaved in the course of the discussion. He did not even have the saving grace of removing himself from the presidency after he said what he said in response to the statement made by the representative of Israel.

34. Do I have to describe the distance that we have traversed over the past 30 years? It can be readily measured by comparing Mr. Malik, the President of the Council in January 1954, with Mr. Salah, the person who occupied the Chair of the Council in October 1983.

35. I have indeed asked for this meeting, and I trust that members of the Council now fully understand why. It would have been a very bad precedent indeed if, after having committed these serious breaches of propriety last month, the person who occupied the Chair of the Council could have got away with impunity. This would have been an encouragement to would-be tamperers with the Chair in the future and I trust that our request, as well as our intervention today, will act as a deterrent to future would-be tamperers with the Chair.

36. Of course, I know that when I concluded there may be some speakers here who will dismiss what I have said by saying that I have insulted the Council and that it is beneath their dignity to respond to my statement. We are accustomed to this kind of response on these occasions, and there is no response on the merits. I rest my case here.

37. I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Council for their patience and I trust that you, Sir, will thank me for the kind words that I addressed to you.

38. The PRESIDENT: I have great pleasure in thanking the representative of Israel for his statement.

39. May I be permitted, in fairness to the Council, to observe respectfully to the representative of Israel that on that occasion the Council had accomplished the main and most important purpose of the meeting, that the Council was subsequently—and I have confirmed this—very heavily engaged on several different issues and that the Council naturally has to give priority to matters of international peace and security rather than to matters of procedure. But, once again, I should like to thank the representative of Israel for his statement.

40. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, may I be permitted, Sir, at this first official meeting of the Security Council this month, to congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency and to express confidence that you, with your customary skill and great professional qualities, will deal successfully with the conduct of our work.

41. I should like also to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the expert and vigorous style of work of your predecessor, the representative of Jordan, whose lot it was to cope with the complex task of conducting the activities of the Council last month.

42. As we all know so well, the present meeting of the Council had not been planned. Having learnt of the insistent demand of the representative of Israel to have this meeting convened, we even reflected on the possibility of whether he might finally be ready to respond to the questions which were addressed to him by the Soviet delegation at the meeting of the Council on 18 January. Might I recall that the questions were as follows: is Israel's annexation of East Jerusalem in keeping with Security Council resolution 242 (1967); is Israel's annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights in keeping with resolution 242 (1967); is Israel's creeping annexation of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip in keeping with resolution 242 (1967)? [*2411th meeting, para. 142.*]

43. I might recall also the statement made by the representative of Israel, who provided an assurance that he was "fully prepared to answer each and every one of those questions at the appropriate time" [*ibid., para. 146*].

44. But even today the representative of Israel did not answer those questions.

45. Today, the procedural statement of the representative of Israel, as well as many of his earlier statements, has been devoted to anything but the question on the agenda of the Council.

46. Moreover, his statement today is a cover-up for the new aggression in the Near East, which Israel is now preparing jointly with its senior strategic partner, the United States. In this connection there is a qualitatively new situation: the United States is henceforth no longer pretending that it is holding back Israel. The United States is openly pushing Israel towards new aggression. Moreover, on this occasion the United States is itself preparing an aggression in the Near East.

47. The Soviet delegation has asked to speak today in order to draw attention to a further dangerous exacerbation of tension in Lebanon. The statements made recently by official personalities of the United States, including the President, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, are highly ominous in character. They are evidence of the fact that the United States Administration is contemplating a large-scale military operation in Lebanon. The public threats by the United States are accompanied by an unprecedented concentration of the United States fleet near the coast of Lebanon. According to numerous items of information, in the near future more than 30 naval vessels of the United States will be taken there, including three aircraft carrier units with hundreds of military aircraft on board. It would seem that the heady military climate now prevailing in Washington is pushing the framers of United States policy towards a further demonstration of military muscle.

48. Having established themselves in Lebanon more than a year ago, the United States has quickly cast aside the fig leaf of peace-keepers. They have proceeded unceremoniously to interfere in the domestic affairs of that country and are trying to convert it into one of their staging areas in the Near East. When they encountered resistance to this new occupation from the national patriotic forces of Lebanon, the United States responded, typically, with the fire of their high-calibre naval artillery, on the pretext of protecting the security of the intervening forces, which is a shopworn argument dating back to the time of the Viet Nam war.

49. Today we see the second act of the Lebanese tragedy being played out. Now Washington intends further to extend the area of its interference. It is preparing a military fist for this purpose in order to carry out a massive strike against the Lebanese patriots. At the same time, the Washington Administration has unleashed a new campaign of provocation against Syria, threatening it with armed punitive action. Claiming to have the right to decide which weapons the Syrian army can or cannot be equipped with, Washington is deliberately whipping up a furor around Syria to exacerbate further the tensions in this region.

50. Behind the smokescreen of this militarist bustle the Administration is making all speed with the co-ordination of actions and strategic co-operation with the Israeli aggressor, which has in its turn firmly entrenched itself on Lebanese soil. Only recently Washington was literally begging Tel Aviv not to withdraw its troops from the regions around Beirut, and now it is evolving plans to include Israel in the planned show of force that it has designed in Lebanon.

51. Looking at the sharp swings in American policy, we cannot help but marvel. Is this really the same country that voted in favour of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982)? As everyone knows, these resolutions called for the immediate cessation of all military activities within Lebanon and for Israel to withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally. However, as members of the Council know so well from very recent experience, United Nations decisions seem in no way to spoil appetites in Washington. It has recently become customary there to follow the logic of the fist and the language of powerful aircraft carriers.

52. The active military preparations by the United States around Lebanon which have taken place since the United States intervention in Grenada are causing serious concern in many States, including the Soviet Union. As was emphasized in the TASS statement of 4 November on this subject:

> "The pretensions of the United States at establishing, in countries whose social system is not to its liking, structures along American lines, its aspiration to place itself and its narrow interests above international law and above the general interests of humanity, and its effort to make force the criterion of justice and legality—all these endeavours will undoubtedly have serious consequences not only for others but also for the United States itself." [*See S/16131, annex.*]

This is something which the architects of American policy should think about seriously while there is still time.

53. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for the kind words he addressed to me.

54. I now call on the representative of Jordan, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

55. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to start by conveying our sincere congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of November. We appreciate your competence and wisdom, and I am confident that you will conduct our work with your well-known ability and skill.

56. I sincerely believe that there is nothing worth replying to in the statement made by the representative of Israel today; the personal insults to me and to the outgoing President of the Council, his allegations and lies, are not worthy of a response.

57. I will not use the discourteous words used by the representative of Israel, but I believe that he should not be allowed to speak before the Council and waste its time; he

should display at least a minimum of seriousness and objectivity.

58. The representative of Israel took it upon himself to decide for the Council how it should proceed and how it should work. The 2480th meeting was adjourned at 1.55 p.m. Three members had asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and Israel was one of them. Although you, Mr. President, have declared open the 2495th meeting, the Israeli representative is still speaking in the context of the 2480th meeting.

59. As you are well aware, Sir, and as are the members of the Council, with most concern for the procedures of the Council, the adjournment of the 2480th meeting was in order. I believe that it is the members here that are competent to apply the rules of procedure of the Council in its work.

60. You are aware, Sir, as are the other members, of the programme of the Council during the period which followed the adjournment of that meeting. I believe I do not have to go into details of that. You are also aware that the adjournment of that meeting was in order. I shall therefore not make any detailed refutation of what the representative of Israel said, including his allegations and lies about the behaviour of the President of the Council last month.

61. Many representatives who have been President of the Security Council have referred with concern to the way in which the time and the serious work of the Council have been abused and disdained by some representatives and how such irresponsible behaviour has contributed to lessening the effectiveness and prestige of the Council.

62. Israel's behaviour at the 2480th meeting was a very clear example of this irresponsible way of acting. In the chamber of the Security Council, the representative of Israel--which for more than 16 years has been occupying Arab territories—tried to sell the Council lies about Israel's desire for peace. And he did that in the context of the item on the situation in Lebanon, one third of which is occupied by Israel. The item under discussion at the meeting in question was the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. He tried to use the Council for Israel's propaganda aims.

63. My absolute conviction of the hypocrisy in Israel's allegations about loving peace and of its disdain for the seriousness of the Council and its prestige had led me, as President of the Council and as representative of Jordan, to point out the foregoing facts.

64. I should like to be brief and to conclude by reading out paragraph 11 of resolution ES-9/1 which was adopted by the General Assembly on 5 February 1982 at its ninth emergency special session, convened to consider the situation in the occupied Arab territories when Israel—whose representative claims it is a peace-loving country—was considering the annexation of the Golan Heights:

> "*[The General Assembly,]*
>
> "*Declares* that Israel's record and actions confirm that it is not a peace-loving Member State and that it has carried out neither its obligations under the Charter nor its commitment under General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949;".*

65. Finally, I believe that the statement made by the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply this morning proves the validity of the procedure followed by the President at the 2480th meeting. There was nothing of substance in what the representative of Israel said.

66. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Jordan for the kind words he addressed to me.

67. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I wish first to tell you, Sir, how pleased we are to see you assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. We are all aware of your great qualities as a diplomat and of your spirit of compromise, and we are convinced that these qualities will be very useful to the Council as we continue our debates this month.

68. I wish also, through you, Mr. President, to extend my delegation's thanks to Mr. Salah, the representative of Jordan, who fulfilled his tasks during a very difficult month with effectiveness, impartiality and unparalleled courtesy. Indeed, that effectiveness, impartiality and courtesy were admired by the entire Security Council. I have nothing more to add.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—May 1992—2,050